

Boucher	Hefner	Pastor
Browder	Hilliard	Payne (NJ)
Brown (CA)	Hinchey	Payne (VA)
Brown (FL)	Holden	Pelosi
Brown (OH)	Hoyer	Peterson (FL)
Bryant (TX)	Jackson-Lee	Peterson (MN)
Cardin	Jacobs	Pickett
Chapman	Jefferson	Pomeroy
Clay	Johnson (CT)	Portman
Clayton	Johnson (SD)	Poshard
Clement	Johnson, E. B.	Quinn
Clyburn	Johnston	Rahall
Coleman	Kanjorski	Rangel
Collins (IL)	Kaptur	Reed
Collins (MI)	Kennedy (MA)	Richardson
Conyers	Kennedy (RI)	Rivers
Costello	Kennelly	Roemer
Coyne	Kildee	Rose
Cramer	Klecicka	Roybal-Allard
de la Garza	Klink	Rush
DeFazio	LaFalce	Sabo
DeLauro	Lantos	Sanders
Dellums	Levin	Sawyer
Deutsch	Lewis (GA)	Scarborough
Dicks	Lipinski	Schroeder
Dingell	Lofgren	Schumer
Dixon	Lowey	Scott
Doggett	Luther	Serrano
Dooley	Maloney	Shays
Doyle	Manton	Sisisky
Durbin	Markey	Skaggs
Edwards	Martinez	Slaughter
Engel	Mascara	Spratt
Eshoo	McCarthy	Stark
Evans	McDermott	Stokes
Farr	McHale	Studds
Fattah	McKinney	Stupak
Fazio	Meehan	Tejeda
Fields (LA)	Meek	Thompson
Filner	Menendez	Thornton
Flake	Mfume	Thurman
Foglietta	Miller (CA)	Torkildsen
Ford	Mineta	Torres
Frank (MA)	Minge	Towns
Frost	Mink	Tucker
Furse	Moakley	Velazquez
Gejdenson	Mollohan	Vento
Gephardt	Moran	Visclosky
Gibbons	Morella	Volkmer
Gonzalez	Murtha	Ward
Gordon	Nadler	Waters
Green	Neal	Watt (NC)
Gutierrez	Oberstar	Waxman
Hall (OH)	Obey	Williams
Hamilton	Olver	Wilson
Harman	Ortiz	Wise
Hastings (FL)	Orton	Woolsey
Hayes	Owens	Wyden
Hefley	Pallone	Wynn

NOT VOTING—5

Becerra	Matsui	Torricelli
Crapo	Reynolds	

□ 1801

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN EN-GROSSMENT OF H.R. 728, LOCAL GOVERNMENT LAW ENFORCEMENT BLOCK GRANTS ACT OF 1995

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 728, as amended, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, cross-references, and punctuation, and to make such stylistic, clerical, technical conforming, and other changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House in amending the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislation days to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 728, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. GEPHARDT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman from Texas, is this the last vote for the evening? How late will we go tomorrow, and what might be the schedule for Thursday.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEPHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, it seems that we will have no more votes today. We will not take up the rule for the National Security Act tonight. We will start tomorrow after a reasonable number of 1 minutes that we will work out with the minority leader and start with the rule on the National Security Act.

Members need to understand that it is the intention of the majority to make sure that we go late enough tomorrow night so that we will be assured of being out at 3 o'clock Thursday for the President's Day recess.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, could the gentleman also give any indication about the schedule for Tuesday and Wednesday so that Members who might want to suggest amendments to bills could get ready to do that?

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, right now we are not prepared to say what will happen Tuesday. We do think we will stick, possibly, to the normal come in at 2, no votes until 5. But that would be announced at a later date.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri for yielding to me.

I just want to rise and commend the majority and particularly the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY]. He and I have risen to engage in a colloquy the last couple weeks to talk about a family-friendly schedule and, in particular, to talk about getting out tonight by 7 o'clock.

I can see that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] is not only good on his word at 7 o'clock, he is an hour early.

A number of families, Congressmen, Congresswomen have come up to me and asked me to end my poetic career

by doing one more poem for the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY]. So I will do this and end in salute to him.

Roses are red,

Violets are blue.

Thanks to DICK ARMEY,

We are out of the stew.

We are into the roses and maybe a sip of wine,

A family-friendly schedule, it's about time.

Mr. Speaker, we are delighted to have this opportunity to spend 1 night with our families, and we look forward to working with the majority in the future, especially after the first 100 days, to see that we can make this body more productive, more efficient and not necessarily working against scheduling time with our families.

I thank the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY].

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks in complimenting our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY]. Even though he does not look like cupid, there is a lot of love in his heart. In fact, he understands how important it is to get out and be with our families, particularly on Valentine's Day.

I just might urge those Members that have been signed up for special orders, that if they would, on both sides of the aisle, would take care in the amount of time that they spend so that our staff can also have a little Valentine's Day break and get out of here early.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

APPROVAL OF BLOCK GRANT APPROACH NOTED IN WASHINGTON POST EDITORIAL

(Mr. HOKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, it is not often I find myself in agreement with the editorial page of the Washington Post, but today's Post shows rare insight and good sense when it says the President should not veto the crime bill that is on the floor because of the block grant program.

The Post recognizes that the President's 100,000 cop program was a fraud, saying that "almost immediately * * * it was challenged by law enforcement experts and some local officials. In fact, the law created a five-year matching program during which the Federal Government's share diminished and eventually disappeared, leaving localities with the full cost of maintaining the new officers."

In other words, it would never have fulfilled its promise of 100,000 new police officers.

The editorial then goes on to make the case for allowing local communities more flexibility in using Federal